IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR

THURSDAY, THE 14TH JUNE 2007 / 24TH JYAISHTA 1929

WP(C).No. 9387 of 2007(P)

PETITIONER:

---

1. YOUSUF, S/O ALAVI RAWTHER,
   POOLAPARAMBIL HOUSE, MALESHAMANGLAM (P.O.),
   TIRUVILWAMALA, THRISSUR DISTRICT.

2. RAVINDRA KUMAR,
   S/O CHELLAPPAN NAIR, ORAMPALLATH HOUSE,
   MALESHAMANGALAM (P.O.), TIRUVILWAMALA,
   THRISSUR DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SMT.A.R.PRAVITHA

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD-
   REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN, VAIDYUTHI BHAVANAM,
   PATTOM,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. ASSSTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
   KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD,
   ELECTRICAL MAJOR SECTION, CHELAKKARA,
   THRISSUR DISTRICT.

3. ASSISTANT ENGINEER,
   KERALA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD,
   ELECTRICAL SECTION, TIRUVILWAMALA,
   THRISSUR DISTRICT.

4. ADDITIONAL DISTRICT MAGISTRATE,
   COLLECTORATE, THRISSUR.

R1 TO R3 BY SC SRI. P.P. THAJUDEEN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 14/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONERS' EXHIBITS:

EXT.P1 TRUE COPY OF THE CAUTION DEPOSIT RECEIPT DATED 22.10.2002 ISSUED TO THE FIRST PETITIONER.

EXT.P2 TRUE COPY OF THE CAUTION DEPOSIT RECEIPT DATED 22.10.2002 ISSUED TO THE 2ND PETITIONER.

EXT.P3 TRUE COPY OF THE SKETCH PREPARED BY THE VILLAGE OFFICER, TIRUVILWAMALA DATED 27.4.2006

EXT.P4 TRUE COPY OF REPORT NO. 162/2005 DATED 9.1.2006 FILED BY THE TAHSILDAR.

EXT.P5 TRUE COPY OF THE HEARING NOTICE ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT.

EXT.P6 TRUE COPY OF THE AGREEMENT DATED 9.11.2006 WITHDRAWING THE OBJECTION BY THE OBJECTORS.

EXT.P7 TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 14.2.2007 SUBMITTED BY THE 2ND PETITIONER BEFORETHE 4TH RESPONDENT.

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

TRUE COPY

P.S. TO JUDGE.

C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR,J.

W.P.C. NO. 9387 OF 2007

Dated this the 14th day of June, 2007

JUDGMENT

Heard counsel for the petitioners, Government Pleader and standing counsel for KSEB. Separate applications filed by petitioners for electric connection were referred for decision by Addl. District Magistrate on account of objections by land owners over whose property line has to pass through. However, counsel for the petitioners submitted that objectors have withdrawn their objections and consequently reference to Addl. District Magistrate has become unnecessary. No orders are also passed by the fourth respondent. In the circumstances, W.P. is disposed of directing the third respondent to give connection to the petitioners within two weeks on petitioners complying with all formalities and on producing consent letters from land owners. In any case, he should draw the line over the pathway causing least inconvenience to least number of neighbouring land owners.

(C.N.RAMACHANDRAN NAIR)
Judge